

No 9/8/86-6Lab/2493.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. H. S. Mechanical Works, I. C. 69, NIT, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 184 of 1985

between

SHRI VIRENDER KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT
OF M/S. H. S. MECHANICAL WORKS, I. C. 69, NIT, FARIDABAD.

Present :—

Shri Darshan Singh for the workman.

None for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This industrial dispute between the workman Shri Virender Kumar and the respondent-management of M/s. H. S. Mechanical Works, I. C. 69, NIT, Faridabad, has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/28-85/14095-100, dated 4th April, 1985 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication. The terms of the reference are :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Virender Kumar, was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Shri Darshan Singh pleads no instructions from the workman. He states that the workman has not turned up inspite of so many reminders given to him. It shows that the workman is not interested to pursue this reference. Hence the award is given that there is no dispute between the parties.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,

Dated the 21st February, 1986.

Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 69, dated 5th March, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the I.D. Act.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Faridabad.

No. 9/7/86-6Lab/2451.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of (i) Transport Commissioner, Haryana, Roadways, Chandigarh (ii) General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 52 of 1985

between

SHRI DHARAMVIR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF (I) (TRANSPORT COMMISSIONER, HARYANA ROADWAYS, CHANDIGARH, (II) GENERAL MANAGER, HARYANA ROADWAYS, SONEPAT.

Present :—

Shri S.N. Solanki, A.R. for the workman.

Shri N. C. Jain, Law Officer for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Dharemvir and the management of (i) Transport Commissioner, Haryana Roadways, Chandigarh (ii) General Manager, Haryana Roadways, Sonapat to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Haryana Government Gazette Notification No. 15145—51, dated the 11th April, 1985:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Dharemvir, is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. After receipt of the order of reference notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The case of the petitioner is that he was employed with the respondent as a Helper with effect from 2nd November, 1932 but his services were terminated on 15th January, 1984 unlawfully without any prior notice or payment of any retrenchment compensation. So, he has prayed for reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, the claim of the workman has been controverted in toto. It is alleged that the petitioner was employed on daily wages with effect from 4th November, 1982 and his services could be terminated at any time without any prior notice and as such, it is alleged that his termination was lawful and legal.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for decision by me on 8th November, 1985 :—

1. Whether the reference is bad in law ? OPR.
2. Whether the termination of services of Shri Dharemvir, is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

5. Before any evidence could be adduced, happily a settlement was arrived at, whereunder the respondent has agreed to reinstate the petitioner with all benefits of previous service but without back wages. In that behalf statement of Shri N.C. Jain, Law Officer of the respondent and that of the petitioner have been recorded. The respondent has further agreed to reinstate the workman within one month from today. So, nothing survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

B. P. JINDAL,

Dated, the 28th February, 1986.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.
Camp Court, Sonapat.

Endst. No. 52-85/368, dated the 10 March, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.
Camp Court, Sonapat.

KULWANT SINGH

Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Labour and Employment Department.